DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 655 HE 015 133

AUTHOR Klein, Thomas; Gaff, Jerry
TITLE Reforming General Education: A Survey.
INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, DC. Center for General Education.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 22p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; *College Curriculum; Course Content; Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Change; Educational Objectives; *General Education; Graduation Requirements; Higher Education; *Liberal Arts; Logical Thinking; Problem Solving; School Surveys; *Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

The nature of program changes taking place in undergraduate general education and factors that affect curricular change were addressed in a survey. A sample of 272 colleges and universities that were conducting serious review or revision of their undergraduate general education programs were sent questionnaires, and 139 responses were received. The majority (58 percent) were four-year colleges with predominantly undergraduate emphases, but 14 percent were community colleges, and 28 percent had several graduate programs. Attitudes toward general education at 71 percent of the schools had become more favorable during the last three years. Eighty-two institutions recently adopted a curricular revision or had a specific proposal before the faculty. Five related aspects of changes in the general curriculum discussed are: curricular structure, subject matter content, skills that are the explicit aim of instruction, the qualitative character of the program, and the amount of change represented by new programs. Two important structural features are the number of hours of general education required for graduation and its proportion of the total curriculum and the amount of prescription. Requirements in the humanities, arts, natural sciences, and social sciences were increased by 32 to 52 percent of the institutions. Skills that received explicit attention were writing (99 percent of the programs), mathematics (82 percent), critical thinking (79 percent) and problem solving (72 percent). Qualitative changes were efforts toward integration, global studies, a four-year course of study, and nonlecture pedagogy. It is suggested that overall program changes are just beginning. A questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216655

REFORMING GENERAL EDUCATION: A SURVEY

THOMAS KLEIN
Bowling Green State University

JERRY GAFF
Association of American Colleges

April, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Association of American Colleges

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NE015133

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
Washington, D. C.

Undergraduate general education has burst into the national spotlight once again as hundreds of diverse colleges and universities are taking a hard look at their programs and making changes designed to strengthen the core of the curriculum. The declaration of the prestigeous Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching that "general education is a disaster area," and the report of the Harvard University task force proposing a new "core curriculum" have focused public attention on the disarray of the curriculum. Yet, already these events are "yesterday's news," and their invisibility masks the more fundamental changes taking place in the broad array of the nation's colleges.

To gain a clearer view of the breadth of this reform movement, the Association of American Colleges conducted a survey with three purposes: a) to discern more clearly the nature of the program changes that are taking place; b) to learn about some of the factors aiding and inhibiting curricular change; and c) to determine how both individual campuses and national associations can further additional reforms.

We selected a sample of 272 colleges and universities, all of which were thought to be conducting a serious review or revision of their undergraduate general education programs. The names of the schools came from several sources -- institutions that participated in special projects, descriptions of efforts found in publications, notices of recipients of grant awards, participants in workshops on the topic, and inquiries from persons requesting assistance with curricular reviews on their campuses. All types of schools were included -- large and small, public and private, four-year and two-year.

We devised a questionnaire that contained items of three types: a) demographic information and attitudes toward general education, completed by all respondents; b) the process of curricular change, answered by individuals from schools undertaking a formal review or revision; and c) the nature of these curricular changes, filled out by persons from institutions with a new program or a specific proposal. The individual most directly responsible for administering the program or conducting the review was asked to complete the form.

The Sample. Completed questionnaires were received from 139 schools in time to be used in the analysis, resulting in a 51 percent response rate. Of this number 125 answered items about the change process and 82 about their new programs. The sample included 58 percent private schools, while 42 percent were public. In terms of size, 34 percent enrolled fewer than 1,500 students, 31 percent between 1,500 and 5,000, 14 percent between 5,000 and 10,000 students, and 22 percent over 10,000 students. The majority of schools (58 percent) were four year colleges with predominantly undergraduate emphases, but 14 percent were community colleges, and 28 percent universities with several graduate programs.

Attitude Changes. A copy of the questionnaire complete with summary results appears in the Appendix, while this essay highlights the major findings. First, attitudes toward general education were reported to have become more favorable during the last three years at the schools in this sample. Seventy one percent said the "overall academic climate" became more favorable at their institutions; 25 percent said there was not much change; and three percent said it was less favorable. Regarding specific groups, administration and faculty changed the most, with 78 percent of the former and 71 percent of the latter said to have developed attitudes more favorable toward general education. Favorable attitudes of academic administrators are not surprising; these persons have an institution-wide view that allows them to become aware of deficiencies, and they are more likely to be connected with the

national debate about general education. Favorable faculty attitudes are somewhat more surprising. They may result because faculty, as front-line observers, find student learning inadequate. Positive faculty attitudes also may result from self-interest; faculty members may be returning to undergraduate instruction because of declines in graduate education and research, or those in the liberal arts may be attempting to regain students lost in recent years to vocational fields. Also, since the great bulk of the schools surveyed had fashioned new programs, the favorable attitudes may reflect faculty enlightenment that occurred during that process.

Curiously, the attitudes of students had not changed at many campuses; 63 percent of the respondents said there was "not much change" compared with 32 percent who reported more favorable and five percent less favorable attitudes. This may reflect the perception of students that general education does not have practical benefits for them. It may also express their experiences that current programs are inadequate, a common view of students in programs with loose distribution requirements (Gaff and Davis, 1981). But it may also indicate that the curricular changes being planned and made by many of the schools have not yet been put in place, or have been such recent revisions that the bulk of students have not yet changed their impressions of non-major courses. In any event, it appears that attitudes, at least of faculty members and administrators, had become more favorable at the schools in this sample; this is necessary for initiating and sustaining any kind of reform in general education.

Institutions were at various stages of curricular revision. Of the 123 that confirmed their institutions were indeed engaged in a formal curricular review, two percent said they were at the talking stage, 22 percent early planning, 14 percent advanced planning, 9 percent approval, 31 percent implementation, and 18 percent evaluation. About five percent chose to write in some other

response. The large number of schools at early stages of curricular change, not to mention the institutions just starting reviews that came to our attention after the survey was conducted, indicates that the general education "revival" is still in its infancy. Although much has been accomplished at many institutions, fewer than half of this sample of institutions at the leading edge of the movement have implemented new programs.

Characteristics of New Programs

Eighty two institutions recently adopted a curricular revision or had a specific proposal before the faculty. An analysis of these programs may provide a glimpse of the kinds of changes in the general curriculum that are emerging from this wave of reform. The discussion will focus on five related aspects--curricular structure, subject matter content, skills that are the explicit aim of instruction, the qualitative character of the program, and the amount of change represented by new programs.

Structure. One of the most important structural features is the number of hours of general education required for graduation, and its proportion of the total curriculum. The mean amount of general education required in four year institutions was 44 semester hours which represented 35 percent of the total required for graduation. For two year colleges the total was 31 or 52 percent. These figures constitute an increase in general education at 59 percent of the schools, no change at 36 percent, and fewer at five percent. The dominant trend is to increase the amount of general education, with a secondary trend to change the course offerings within the same block of time already alloted. This result, reinforced by other findings that follow, suggests a shift of values away from narrow specialization and professional training toward broader educational purposes.

The second aspect of structure examined by the survey was the amount of prescription. A limited range of courses to meet various area breadth requirements was found in 88 percent of the institutions, reflecting an increase in 68 percent of the schools. Interdisciplinary core courses were found in 55 percent of the programs; the use of a core curriculum was reported to have increased at 60 percent of the institutions. Requirements of specific disciplinary courses, such as European history or American literature, were found in 47 percent of the programs, an increase from previous requirements in 43 percent of the cases. Student choice from a virtually unlimited range of courses, the loose distribution scheme, was a part of only 15 percent of these new programs, a decrease in 56 percent of the cases. Free electives were even more rare, being found in only seven percent of the cases. Thus, most institutions were opting for some combination of limited distribution, interdisciplinary core courses, and required disciplinary courses as the primary means of organizing their general education offerings. These changes mark a significant move away from the smorgasbord metaphor for general education and indicate a greater emphasis on a limited menu featuring a more balanced meal.

Content. During recent years there have been calls for more attention to the humanities (Commission on the Humanities, 1980), science (Science and Engineering Education for the 1980's and Beyond, 1980), and foreign language and international studies (President's Commission, 1979). It is no accident that each of these liberal arts subject areas figures prominently in new general education programs. Requirements in the humanities, arts, natural sciences, and social sciences were increased at 32-52 percent of the institutions. In very few instances were requirements in any of these areas decreased.

In addition to exposing students to various subject matter areas, many new general education programs are designed to expose students to various "modes of thought." Forty two percent said this approach received "a great deal" of emphasis with another 49 percent checking "somewhat"; fewer than 10 percent said it had "very little" emphasis at their schools. Analytical thinking, the ability to examine arguments and to reason logically and critically, was said to play "a major part" in 62 percent of the programs, while synthetic thinking, making connections between separate items, was so regarded in 53 percent. Moral, empirical, and aesthetic modes were treated in a major way in 48, 42, and 38 percent of the sample, respectively. These results suggest that the traditional emphasis on rational thinking is gaining renewed attention today as opposed to the stress on "relevance" and "narcissism" that tended to characterize the reforms of the 1960's.

Skills. Most general education curricula, according to these results, were aimed at developing various skills, both basic and advanced. Skills that received explicit attention were led by writing in 99 percent of the programs, mathematics in 82 percent, critical thinking in 79 percent, and problem solving in 72 percent of the cases. These are followed by research-library skills (63 percent), speaking (61 percent), foreign language (57 percent), computer literacy (45 percent), and interpersonal relations (34 percent). In over half the institutions these new curricula gave greater attention to the basic skills of writing and mathematics as well as to the more sophisticated skills of critical thinking and computer literacy than in the programs they replaced.

Since writing is one of the most fundamental of learning skills and is receiving a great deal of attention independently of the interest in general education, several questions sought to determine how this component was handled.

The most common mechanism, in 84 percent of the cases, was a required course on expository writing. Also, 78 percent said writing is explicitly taught in courses other than English, 72 percent designated some specific amount of writing students should do, and 55 percent reported a required proficiency examination. From these results, it seems that two or more of these approaches are employed at most schools in an attempt to increase student facility with their native language.

Qualitative Aspects. Several items probed the qualitative aspects of new programs. One set of categories was derived from Bergquist (1977), who specified various philosophical bases of a curriculum, and respondents were asked to check up to three alternatives that best described their programs. The two dominant responses were "discipline-based," which was selected by 80 percent, and "skills-based," selected by 58 percent. These results suggest that the academic disciplines remain the heart of general education, whatever interdisciplinary features may be included. Less frequently mentioned were other alternatives: 30 percent said their programs were based on a study of selected themes, 25 percent on heritage, 24 percent on certain competencies, and 21 percent on values. The fact that only four percent said their overall curricular model was based on student initiative marks almost a complete reversal from the last great wave of curricular change when, during the 1960's and early '70's, student choice was a driving force.

Another set of items inquired into several features that often are stressed in contemporary debates about general education. For instance, 69 percent said their programs include interdisciplinary or other integrative components; in these cases integration of knowledge is a formal part of the program rather than simply left for the students to attempt on their own. Fifty-five percent

reported they require study of foreign cultures, with a quarter specifying that this must be non-Western. This requirement is an effort to correct the parochialism of the course of study by introducing global perspectives. In 59 percent of the four year institutions general education courses extended over the entire baccalaureate experience, rather than being simply introductory and something to be gotten out of the way before specialized work in the major can commence in earnest. Similarly, 86 percent said they were seeking to transcend the use of lectures to large numbers of students as the predominant methodology of general education courses. Taken together these responses suggest a significant change in the character of general education.

One additional item, however, suggests one area with little change from past practice. Sixty nine percent of schools reported that courses offered by departments as introductions for their majors do, in most cases, serve as general education for non-majors. Although there is efficiency in allowing courses to do double duty, the practice may have the pernicious effect of allowing the concerns of preparing a major to supercede and, therefore, severely diminish the concerns of broadly educating the general student.

Amount of Change. Given the nature and extent of the changes discussed above, it is understandable that 58 percent of the respondents said their institutions made a "comprehensive change," 40 percent "changed some component(s)," and eight percent made "very little change." When asked about evaluation, only seven percent reported that they had already conducted one. Thirty nine percent said they have specific plans, 34 percent intend to evaluate but have no specific plan, and another 15 percent "haven't talked about it much." This suggests an important need for the future.

In summary, the characteristics of new general education programs reflect many differences from the old ones that typically employed a loose distribution

scheme. By and large, today's versions incorporate more structure, more liberal arts subject matter, more attention to basic and advanced skills, and qualitative changes toward integration, global studies, a four year course of study, and non-lecture pedagogy.

The Process of Curricular Change

Changing a curriculum is such a difficult and complex task that it has been compared to moving a cemetery. Actually, a great deal already has been learned about the process of curricular change (Conrad, 1980; Gaff, 1980; Wee, 1981). For that reason, this topic received little attention in the survey.

Two items dealing with factors hindering and assisting reform were included, however. From a list of seven factors drawn from other studies and reports on barriers to change, respondents were asked to indicate the two most important barriers they encountered. Department "turfism" was checked by 58 percent, faculty resistance by 40 percent, and competition from majors and specializations by 30 percent. Clearly, departments represent major power blocks which can either encourage or resist the strengthening of common learning. In fact, it appears to be no accident that most new programs are heavily discipline-based, as we have seen, when departmental and faculty forces are so powerful. It is noteworthy that one factor frequently discussed as a barrier, lack of funds, was mentioned by only 13 percent of the schools. Evidently good ideas and political support for them from departments, faculty, and specializations were most critical, even in a time of retrenchment, in changing the curriculum.

A configuration of facilitating factors also is consistent with earlier experience. Support of key administrators was cited by 62 percent, support of key faculty members by 46 percent, work of the general education committee by 37 percent, and widespread involvement of the faculty by 24 percent. Apart from the expected support of administrators, these data substantiate the irony pointed

out by Conrad (1980, p. 105): "Although the impetus for change usually emanates from individual faculty members, the primary retardant of curricular change is more often than not the faculty-at-large." Strategies to win over the faculty at large--enlisting faculty leadership, operating an effective committee, and involving large numbers of faculty--seemed crucial to successful reform according to these results.

The role of external resources in assisting campus curricular change was explored in terms of possible assistance that could be provided by the Association of American Colleges. Sixty eight percent of the respondents said external resources, even the non-financial sort that could be provided, would assist their own reform efforts. When asked to react to specific activities, the vast majority said they would "probably" or "definitely" use each one that was listed. Over three quarters of the sample said they would benefit from a newsletter, circulation of reports and other materials from campuses, focused studies, conferences and workshops, a clearinghouse of information and materials, and AAC's serving as a national advocate for general education.

Summary

There is a national revival of general education, as evidenced by the curricular reviews occurring on many college campuses. It is difficult to know how broad-based the movement is, but it does embrace colleges of every type and in all parts of the country. Although it is still very early, we can see from this survey the main features of the new programs starting to emanate from all of this activity. Favorable attitudes, particularly on the part of faculty members and administrators, undergird a number of specific programmatic changes. These curricular changes include a larger proportion of required general education courses, additional structure with less student choice, more liberal arts subject matter, more attention to basic and advanced skills, and a series of qualitative changes consistent with general education purposes and philosophy.

However, these changes that have been achieved, often with enormous effort and over long periods of time, are still fragile. Some have yet to receive final approval. Many have yet to be implemented. Most have yet to attract, inform, and engage large numbers of faculty and students. Almost all have yet to be evaluated, and probably modified in light of the results. In short, the distance that has been traveled is only the beginning of the journey, even for the schools that are at the forefront of this movement. But if the colleges and universities that are actively planning new programs, to say nothing of the even larger numbers that may start to review their offerings in the near future, develop the kinds of programs that the schools in this survey have, these results may provide a preview of the characteristics of the general education curriculum of the future.

REFERENCES

Bergquist, W. H. "Eight Curricular Models," In G. Quehl and M. Gee (eds). Developing the College Curriculum Washington, D. C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977, pp. 87-109.

Commission on the Humanities, The Humanities in American Life. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Conrad, C. F. "Initiating and Implementing Change." In Project on General Education Models General Education: Issues and Resources. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Colleges, 1980, pp. 102-116.

Gaff, J. G. "Avoiding the Potholes: Strategies for Reforming General Education." Educational Record, Fall, 1980, pp. 50-59.

Gaff, J. G. and Davis, M. L. "Student Views of General Education." Liberal Education, Summer, 1981, pp. 112-123.

President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Strength Through Wisdom. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

National Science Foundation. Science and Engineering: Education for the 1980s and Beyond. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Wee, D. On General Education: Guidelines for Reform. New Haven, Connecticut: Society for Values in Higher Education, 1981.

APPENDIX

Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
202/387-3760

Dear Colleague:

Strengthening undergraduate general education seems to be a growing concern on the nation's college campuses. In addition to the publications, conferences, and special projects dealing with the issues, many schools have started toreview or revise their own programs. One purpose of this questionnaire is to begin to take stock of these curricular reviews on college campuses and to discern the nature of the changes that are taking place in the general curriculum.

This survey is being conducted by the newly established Center for General Education at the Association of American Colleges. By taking the pulse of the reform efforts, we hope to be able to plan activities that will assist curriculum leaders on a variety of campuses. You can help by completing the sections that pertain to your institution.

> Part I should be completed by persons from <u>all</u> institutions;
> Part II by persons from institutions actively engaged in reviewing or revising their curricula; and
> Part III by persons from schools with specific proposals or new programs.

All responses will be treated as strictly confidential; no mention of individuals or institutions by name will be made in any reports; and nobody else on your campus will have access to the data. We will summarize the results, and will send a copy to everyone responding so that all of us can see the scope and character of changes in general education.

When you have completed the questionnaire please return it to us at the above address. Be sure to fill out the mailing label at the end of the form so that we can return the results to you when they are available.

Since we must complete analyzing and summarizing the results before the end of the year, an early response would be very helpful. If possible, please return the form <u>before the end of October</u>; we must receive it early in November for it to be included in the analysis.

If you have descriptive materials about your work in general education — reports, proposals, idea papers, or the like — that you would be willing to share, we would be eager to receive them.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Thomas Klein

Thomas Klein
National Fellow

Jerry G. Gaff
Director, Center for General Education

The National Association for Liberal Learning

GENERAL EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

For purposes of this questionnaire, general education is regarded as the part of the curriculum required of all students. It is often referred to as the "breadth" component, to differentiate it from the "depth" major and from free electives. It is sometimes called the "core," sometimes "distribution requirements."

PART I: Your Institution To be completed by all institutions

1. Name of institution: _____

2. Control:
   - 58% 1. Private
   - 42 2. Public
   - ____ 3. Other: _____

3. Size:
   - 34% 1. Under 1,500 students
   - 30 2. 1,500-5,000 students
   - 14 3. 5,000-10,000 students
   - 22 4. Over 10,000 students

4. Type:
   - 14% 1. Two year college
   - 58 2. Four year college, predominately undergraduate
   - 28 3. University with several graduate programs

5. Selectivity:
   - 35% 1. Low -- open admissions
   - 50 2. Moderate
   - 15 3. High

6. How would you say attitudes regarding general education have changed over the last three years for each of the following?

	Less Favorable 1	Not Much Change 2	More Favorable 3
1. Students	5%	63%	32%
2. Faculty	4	25	71
3. Administration	3	19	78
4. The overall academic climate	3	25	71

Briefly state major reasons for changes:

7. We are interested in learning about institutions actively working on general education. This includes schools reviewing or revising their programs as well as those implementing or evaluating recent program changes. Is your institution involved in any of these forms of general education changes?
   - 11% 1. No
   - 88 2. Yes

If your answer is "no," this is the end of the questionnaire. If "yes," please complete Part II.

PART II. Curricular Change — To be completed by institutions engaged in reviewing or revising their curricula

N=125

1. At what stage in the review-revision process is your institution?
   - 2% 1. Talking stage -- we have not established a committee or formally launched the effort.
   - 22 2. Early-planning stage -- a committee has been established and is working toward a proposal.
   - 14 3. Advanced-planning stage -- a committee has been established and has a specific proposal.
   - 9 4. Approval stage -- the committee is working to secure approval.
   - 31 5. Implementation stage -- a revised program has been approved and is being carried out.
   - 18 6. Evaluation stage -- the program is being assessed.
   - 5 7. Other (explain): _____

2. If your institution is beyond the talking stage, name of committee or group responsible for the review or revision: _____

   _____

   Name and title of person chairing the group or administering the program: _____

(This information will be used for future mailings.)

3. Is the review or revision institution-wide?
   - 20% 1. No. Name of unit in which review is located: _____
   - 80 2. Yes

4. What have been the major obstacles to the improvement of general education? (Check the two most important)
   - 4% 1. Little faculty interest in general education
   - 40 2. Faculty resistance to change
   - 2 3. Little administrative support
   - 58 4. Department "turfism"
   - 30 5. Competition from Department majors and specializations.
   - 18 6. Competition from vocational interests
   - 13 7. Lack of funds
   - 21 8. Other: _____

5. What major factors have helped the most in your efforts to reform general education? (Check the two most important)
   - 46% 1. Support of key faculty members
   - 62 2. Support of key administrators
   - 37 3. Work of the general education committee
   - 24 4. Widespread involvement of the faculty
   - 5 5. Initiatives of certain departments
   - 12 6. External resources (please identify: _____)
   - 7 7. Other: _____

6. On the basis of your experience, what advice would you give others who may be starting a curricular reform effort?

7. Which ideas, writings, persons, meetings, or other external resources have been of greatest help in strengthening general education?

8. Can you think of additional external resources -- such as might be provided by A.A.C.'s Center for General Education -- that would be of assistance to your reform efforts?

32% 1. No
68 2. Yes

If yes, please explain: _____

9. Below are several possible activities of the Center for General Education. For each indicate whether your institution would utilize it, assuming modest charges would be made for materials, workshops, and the like.

	Probably Not 1	Probably Yes 2	Definitely Yes 3
1. Publish a newsletter with substantive articles, program examples, information about upcoming events, etc.	7%	48%	44%
2. Operate a clearinghouse responsive to inquiries about aspects of general education	24	50	26
3. Provide campus consultation on a cost-sharing basis	41	43	16
4. Offer advice about possible consultants	31	47	22
5. Plan and organize conferences or workshops on various topics	18	65	17
6. Assemble a temporary consortium of schools to share their experiences regarding reforms	36	49	15
7. Organize an interest group as a continuing organization within AAC	33	51	16
8. Arrange panels to make presentations at professional conferences	29	52	19
9. Circulate reports, papers, and curricular materials from campuses	10	52	37
10. Conduct focused studies (such as this survey)	17	51	32
11. Serve as a national advocate of the importance of general education	13	34	53
12. Other: _____	67	-	33

If you have a recently revised program or a specific program before the faculty, go on to Part III. If not, this is the end of the questionnaire.

Part III. Characteristics of New Programs

In this section we are interested in the characteristics of new general education programs. Please answer the following questions in terms of the revised program you recently adopted or the specific proposal most likely to be adopted. Since general education requirements may vary for different degrees and major fields of study, answer the questionnaire in terms of the most generic program at your institution. For two year schools, this may mean the Associate of Arts degree and for four year schools, the program for the Bachelor of Arts.

N=82

1. Indicate the number of credit hours required in your new general education program and the total number of hours required for graduation.
   1. Required in general education: 44 sem. hours -4yr./31 sem.hr.-2yr.
   2. Required for graduation: 124 sem. hours -4yr./60 sem.hr.-2yr.
   3. Is this based on a: 15% 1. Quarter or 85% 2. Semester system?
   4. Is the number of hours in your new general education program fewer, the same, or more than in the previous one?
      - 5% 1. Fewer
      - 36 2. Same
      - 59 3. More

2. For each of the following academic areas, indicate the number of credit hours (either quarter or semester) required, and whether these are less, the same, or more than were required previously.

	Credits Quarter (1)	or Semester (2)	Less (1)	Same (2)	More (3)
1. English Composition	(39)	5	3%	53%	44%
2. Mathematics	(40)	4	2	47	52
3. Foreign Languages	(41)	8	8	61	31
4. Humanities	(42)	9	5	48	47
5. The Arts	(43)	4	-	58	42
6. Social Sciences	(44)	7	16	52	32
7. Natural Sciences	(45)	7	9	57	33
8. Physical Education	(46)	3	7	87	6

3. In addition to exposing students to various subject matter areas, some general education programs are designed to expose students to various "modes of thought" (such as moral, aesthetic, logical). How much emphasis on modes of thought would you say characterizes your new program?
   - 10% 1. Very little
   - 49 2. Somewhat
   - 41 3. A great deal

4. Are the following modes of thought an explicit part (e.g., a required course or competency) of your new program?

	Not an explicit part 1	Yes, a minor part 2	Yes, a major part 3
1. Aesthetic (cultivate taste, imagination, creativity)	16%	46%	37%
2. Moral (develop ethical sensitivity, examine value implications)	21	30	48
3. Analytical (examine arguments, reason logically and critically)	12	25	62
4. Synthetic (make connections between separate items, think holistically)	19	28	53
5. Empirical (test hypotheses, study scientific methods)	19	39	42

5. Some general education programs are designed to develop various skills. For each of the following skills, check whether its development is or is not an explicit part of your new program. Also, indicate whether the new program gives less, the same, or more attention to each than the previous one.

	Skills? No 1	Yes 2		Less 1	Same 2	More 3
1. Writing	1%	99%	(61)	-	29%	71%
2. Speaking	39	61	(62)	6	48	45
3. Mathematics	18	82	(63)	-	33	67
4. Computer literacy	55	45	(64)	-	47	53
5. Critical thinking	20	79	(65)	-	41	59
6. Problem solving	28	72	(66)	-	52	48
7. Research/library	37	63	(67)	1	57	42
8. Interpersonal relations	66	34	(68)	5	73	21
9. Foreign language	43	57	(69)	5	60	34
10. Other _____	0	100		14	14	71

6. Writing is one skill that seems to be receiving a lot of attention these days.

a. Does your new program have a required writing component?

2% 1. No
98 2. Yes

b. If yes, in this component:

	No 1	Yes 2
1. Is there a required course on expository writing?	16%	84%
2. Is there a designated amount of writing?	28	72
3. Is student writing read critically by instructors?	2	97
4. Is a proficiency examination required?	45	55
5. Is writing explicitly taught in courses other than English?	22	78

7. How is the general education or breadth requirement structured? For each of the following, please indicate whether it is part of your new program and whether its role is less, the same or more than in the previous one.

	Is Not Part 1	Is A Part 2		Less 1	Same 2	More 3
1. Students must take interdisciplinary core courses	45%	55%	(10)	3%	37%	60%
2. Students must take specified courses, e.g. European History, American Literature	53	47	(11)	4	51	43
3. Students choose from a limited range of courses to meet area requirements, e.g. humanities, sciences, social sciences	12	88	(12)	6	26	68
4. Students may choose from a virtually unlimited range of courses to meet area requirements, e.g. humanities, sciences, etc.	85	15	(13)	56	41	3
5. Students choose from totally free electives with no regard for areas	93	7	(14)	45	54	.

8. Which of the following curriculum models most closely conveys the overall character of your new general education program. (Check up to three that come the closest.)

80% 1. Discipline -based: students take a number of courses in a variety of disciplines, from groups like the humanities, sciences and social sciences.

25 2. Heritage-based: students study about their own cultural and historical backgrounds.

30 3. Theme-based: A specific problem or issue is studied in a way that encompasses a variety of academic disciplines.

23 4. Competency-based: A set of competencies which a student is to acquire or demonstrate is identified and guides the curriculum.

14 5. Methods-based: Modes of thought used in various academic fields are analyzed.

58 6. Skills-based: Students are taught a number of basic and advanced intellectual skills, such as communications and critical thinking.

4 7. Student-based: Students are given a significant role in determining the content, methodology and evaluation of their learning.

21 8. Value-based: Students are taught to clarify and expand their own values.

6 9. Other: _____

9. Does your new general education program contain requirements for inter-disciplinary or other integrative study?

31% 1. No

69 2. Yes, briefly describe: _____

10. Are students required to study some foreign cultures?

45% 1. No

30 2. Yes, but it can be a Western one

24 3. Yes, and it must be a non-Western one

11. (For four year schools only) Are students expected to take general education courses over their entire baccalaureate experience?
   41% 1. No
   59 2. Yes. Briefly describe upper level requirements:

12. Do the courses offered by departments as introductions for their majors also serve as general education for non-majors?
   31% 1. Not in most cases
   69 2. Yes, in most cases

13. General education courses often are taught by lectures to large numbers of students. Are non-lecture methods of instruction a part of your new program?
   14% 1. No
   86 2. Yes. Please describe what is done to encourage alternatives to lectures:

14. Overall, how much change would you say the new curriculum represents compared to the previous one?
   2% 1. We made very little change
   39 2. We changed some component(s)
   58 3. We made a comprehensive change

15. What are you doing about evaluating your new program?
   15% 1. We haven't talked about it much
   34 2. We intend to evaluate it but have no specific plan
   39 3. We have specific plans for evaluation
   7 4. We already have conducted an evaluation
   5 5. Other: _____

16. Looking ahead, what are the major needs you anticipate during the coming months?